



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,773	12/28/2001	Benn Bollay	10547-0016-999	2128
7590 11/30/2005				
Hughes Electronics Coporation Corporate Patents & Licensing P.O.Box 956 Bidg. R11, Mail Station A109 El Sagundo, CA 90245-0956		EXAMINER BLOUNT, STEVEN		
		ART UNIT 2668 PAPER NUMBER		
DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 20 and 23 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent application 20020059451 to Haviv in view of the Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

With regard to claim 1, Haviv teaches content filter router 16 which receives packets which would include the address of the said router just before it receives the packet, and filters the packet before sending it to content servers 14. See page 2 par 0021.

Haviv does not however teach the filtering information to be presented in list form.

AAPA on page 3 lines 28+ teaches presenting this information in a list.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have collected the filtering information of Haviv in list form in light of the teachings of AAPA in order that the content may be filtered more efficiently.

With regard to claim 2, see the routing to servers 14.

With regard to claim 3, see the discussion of ports in paragraph 56.

With regard to claims 4 – 6, the use of a routing protocol would be obvious, and the choice of BGP would be an obvious choice.

With regard to claim 7, see the discussion of additional filtering in paragraph 21.

With regard to claim 8, members 14 would be obvious to connect to a service provider.

With regard to claim 9, see the discussion of the ports and the list above.

With regard to claim 10, the use of routing tables is well known in the art.

With regard to claim 11, see the discussion of checking the list above.

With regard to claim 12, the second destination would obviously be removed.

With regard to claim 13, see the discussion above.

With regard to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 1 above and note that the method steps are inherent in the teachings of the apparatus.

With regard to claims 15 - 16, see the discussion of the multiple filter routers above and note that this would make the determination step obvious.

With regard to claim 17, note the use of the server 14 above.

With regard to claim 18, the use of an (on/off type) indicator would be obvious.

With regard to claim 19, see the use of a level for the source address would be obvious in order that the proper filter may be applied.

With regard to claim 20, see the discussion of the use of a list and multiple levels of filtering above.

With regard to claim 23, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented the teachings of Haviv/AAPA in software in order to insure the repeatability of the process.

With regard to claims 24 – 25, see the discussion of claim 1 above.

3. Claims 21 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent application 20020059451 to Haviv in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art as applied

Art Unit: 2668

above to claims 1 – 20 and 23 – 25, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,560,233 to Hatanaka et al.

Haviv/AAPA teach the invention as described above, but do not teach a router comprising a CPU, I/O ports, or memory. This is taught in Hatanaka et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented the filtering router of Haviv/AAPA in a router with a CPU, I/O ports, and memory, in light of the teachings of Hatanaka et al, in order to provide a means for implementing the filtering of the packets.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Blount whose telephone number is 703-305-0319. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Chieh Fan, can be reached on 571 – 272 - 3042. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SB

11/24/05

Application/Control Number: 10/040,773

Page 5

Art Unit: 2668


Ajit Patel
Primary Examiner